DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 335 IR 054 786

AUTHOR	Boultbee, Paul G.
TITLE	Collegial Evaluation of Professional Librarians.
PUB DATE	92
NOTE	30p.; Paper presented at the Annual CEDA Conference (1st, 1992).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Libraries; *Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Utilization; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Librarians; *Peer Evaluation; Performance; *Personnel Evaluation; Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS	*Librarian Evaluation; *Performance Based Evaluation; Red Deer College AB

ABSTRACT

This article briefly outlines the need for evaluation, the benefits that can accrue to both the individual and the institution, and the similarities and differences between performance evaluations for non-teaching faculty (counselors and librarians) and teaching faculty. The Red Deer College performance evaluation package is discussed in detail. More specifically, each component of the package from eight required competencies for librarians to the evaluation forms to be filled out by staff, peers, students, chairperson, etc. are described. (Seven appendixes contain evaluation forms and questionnaires.) (Contains 7 references.) (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 365 335

COLLEGIAL EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIANS

Paul G. Boultbee
Red Deer College
Red Deer, Alberta, Canada

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ABSTRACT:

This article briefly outlines the need for evaluation, the benefits that can accrue to both the individual and the institution, and the similarities and differences between performance evaluations for non-teaching faculty (counsellors and librarians) and teaching faculty. The Red Deer College performance evaluation package is discussed in detail. More specifically, each component of the package from eight required competencies for librarians to the evaluation forms to be filled out by staff, peers, students, chairperson, etc. are described.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Paul G. Boultbee

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INTRODUCTION:

According to Patricia Wallace, "The intent of the evaluation is to encourage faculty to engage in positive activities for the mutual benefit of the individual and the university." (Wallace 285) At Red Deer College, we agree that the performance evaluation of librarians is a benefit to the individual and the institution, including our students, our peers, and our library. We also agree that those who will benefit from the performance evaluation should have direct input into it. Hence, the collegial nature of the programme. Evaluations are not imposed from above but rather are an amalgamation of thoughtful feedback from a number of sources.

The individual librarian must have a clearly defined direction for his or her professional energies. An effective performance evaluation programme can indicate both an individual's strengths and weaknesses. Such a programme may turn up evidence of a newly acquired competence, a developing professional interest or, quite possibly, the beginning of frustration, boredom, or restlessness.

At its most basic level, performance evaluation measures employee output, but a good performance evaluation must measure this output against an established set of criteria. And, as Rebecca Kroll points out, "the performance appraisal program should ensure

exact information as to expectations, as well as feedback on how well those expectations are being met." (Kroll 28) Both administrators and faculty, be they librarians or teaching faculty, must sit down together and establish appropriate performance evaluation criteria and expectations. It is certainly not very wise for one group to impose its criteria or expectations on another, nor are 'hidden agendas' conducive to effective performance evaluation. Above all, the performance evaluation process, from beginning to end, must be conducted in an atmosphere of trust and respect.

Many performance evaluation programmes are based on job descriptions. If this is the case, it is important that the job description spell out clearly the expectations of the supervisor, the library, and the college or university as well as the duties of the individual who will hold the position. There are no job descriptions for faculty at Red Deer College and therefore many of the components of the performance evaluation package become very important in delineating the expectations of all who are involved.

A good performance evaluation programme also helps to reduce uncertainty within the organization and can function as a check to ensure that all members are striving toward the same goals. After all, both college and library administrations need and deserve to know about the plans of the faculty and, conversely, faculty need and deserve to know the plans of the administration. Properly conducted performance evaluations, at all levels, keep everyone informed.

Kroll also indicates that "[t]he ideal performance evaluation program would do more than look to the past: it would also be of crucial importance for the present and the future, by helping the library administration in three areas: monitoring ongoing activity, planning ahead, and motivating library faculty to excel both inside and outside the confines of the library organization." (Kroll 30) This statement can also be applied to each faculty member involved in the performance evaluation programme. We, too, need to monitor our activities and plan ahead, and, perhaps most importantly, we must be motivated in some way to excel inside and outside the organization.

THE RED DEER COLLEGE PROGRAMME:

The performance evaluation programme for librarians at Red Deer College corresponds closely to the programme used for counsellors and teaching faculty. All three groups are faculty members of the college and the performance evaluation methods used are very similar.

All sessional faculty (those members employed for a term-certain period and carrying a full workload for a period of at least eight months but not exceeding one year) and probationary faculty (those members in the initial three year period leading to continuous appointment) submit a performance evaluation package annually. Faculty members on continuous appointment (those who have completed their probationary periods and have received tenure) need undergo a formal performance evaluation only when called upon to do so by their Dean. (Prior to July, 1991 continuous appointment faculty members submitted performance evaluation packages every three years. However, these faculty members are expected to collect data on a regular basis.)

All faculty are evaluated against an established list of competencies which outline the expectations of the position. There are separate lists for librarians, counsellors, and teaching faculty but the format and intent are the same. Each list of competencies has been established through consultation and mutual agreement.

All faculty members must be evaluated by students. Teaching faculty request evaluation feedback from their classes towards the end of each term. Counsellors receive feedback from workshop participants and individual clients. Librarians solicit feedback following Information Literacy classes which are conducted throughout the term.

All faculty must also be evaluated by their peers and their Chairpersons.

Finally, all faculty who wish to receive professional development funds must submit an annual Professional Development Profile which outlines each individual's professional development plans for the next three-to-five years. This document allows the faculty member to plan an appropriate professional development strategy; it gives the administration a better idea of where

individuals are headed in their professional lives; and it informs peers of each other's interests and pursuits.

These, then, are the common threads that run through the performance evaluation programme for librarians, counsellors, and teaching faculty. In all three situations there are other elements of the programme that may be unique to the discipline or the Divisional Dean.

Librarians are evaluated on eight competencies:

1. Planning for Effective Service

   (a) Establishes appropriate goals and objectives which are consistent with those of the department, the division, and the College's mandate and core mission.
   (b) Manages library space effectively.
   (c) Adapts services to meet identified needs as reflected in changes in the College mandate and in the curriculum needs of users.
   (d) Incorporates current developments where appropriate.
   (e) Develops and implements appropriate procedures and policies for his/her area.

2. Communication Effectiveness

   (a) Effectively communicates information, direction or assistance to individual users.
   (b) Communicates effectively, both verbally and through the use of instructional aids such as blackboards, audio-visual tools, demonstrations, etc. during classroom presentations.
   (c) Treats all subject matter objectively.
   (d) Accomplishes stated objectives for learning.

3. Learning Environment and Support

   (a) Creates an environment in which users are free to express themselves and ask questions.
   (b) Creates and maintains user interest.
   (c) Encourages users to think critically/creatively.
   (d) Encourages users to assume responsibility for their learning.

4. Management Effectiveness

   (a) Selects, develops and evaluates staff in area of responsibility.
   (b) Maintains effective working relationships with staff.
   (c) Assists in the preparation of budget requirements.
   (d) Prepares annual and other reports.
   (e) Achieves goals and objectives set for his/her area.

5. Knowledge of Discipline

   (a) Is well read, knowledgeable and current in terms of breadth/depth in his/her discipline.
   (b) Has a thorough knowledge of resources and collections.

6. Practice of Discipline

   (a) Selects learning materials (print and non-print), using recognized professional theories, methods and techniques, which complement and supplement curriculum objectives.
   (b) Is effective in the application of his/her discipline to his/her specific position.

7. Professional Responsibilities

   (a) Engages in appropriate developmental activities.
   (b) Strives to increase his/her effectiveness as a librarian.
   (c) Maintains a high level of professional ethics.
   (d) Participates effectively in departmental/divisional activities.
   (e) Operates in concert with College policies and procedures.
   (f) Accepts responsibility for establishing and maintaining effective working relationships.

8. Contribution to College and Community

   (a) Maintains appropriate participation with College and/or discipline related community activities.

For librarians, the performance evaluation process begins early in the evaluation period with an interview between the librarian and

the dean of the Division. At this initial meeting, the librarian and the Dean reach an agreement on appropriate data-gathering and data-analysis processes. At the same meeting, the Dean specifies the standards by which the competencies, listed above, will be measured. These standards often take the form of percentages, such as 80% positive responses to a particular question on the student questionnaire. The librarian is then responsible for gathering all the necessary information, analyzing the data, drawing conclusions about his or her performance, and proposing methods of remediation for any identified weaknesses.

THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PACKAGE:

The performance evaluation package required of every faculty member is submitted at the end of the evaluation period (normally in May). It consists of a number of components. Some will vary from Division to Division:

1. Dean's Summary: This prose reaction to the performance evaluation package is written after the Dean has read the package and after the Dean and the librarian have met to discuss the package. It contains the Dean's comments and suggestions. These comments and suggestions may refer only to the package's contents or may refer to other issues (such as how data-analysis may be conducted in future or suggested future professional development activities). This written narrative is required by College policy.

2. Dean's Summary Report: In this one page checklist (Appendix I), the Dean must indicate whether or not the librarian is competent or unsatisfactory in the eight required competencies. The ratings represent the Dean's assessment of performance based on information from students, peers, supervisor, and the librarian being evaluated. This checklist is required by College policy. If the Dean judges that the faculty member is not competent in one or more of the core competencies, then the Dean and the faculty member must meet to discuss either the need for remediation or the need for further evidence of faculty competence. They must also decide on the process by which the faculty member will provide evidence or remediate the weakness and the criteria by which competence will be measured.

3. Self-Evaluation Report: This prose report written by the faculty member being evaluated, based on information gathered, is the

central document of the performance evaluation package. It must address every core competency though there need not be commentary on every criterion in each competency. However, the commentary for each competency must include a response to any significantly low scores on any questions in the evaluation instrument used to gauge student feedback, a response to any significant written comments made by a student, peer, supervisor, or others, and a summary of all data and comments, strengths and weaknesses, including a brief indication of what action the faculty member intends to undertake in order to help remedy any weaknesses. This written narrative is required by College policy.

4. Overall Summary of Data by Competency: This is an optional one page, point-form summary of the Self-Evaluation Report.

5. Student Questionnaire Results: This summary of responses, required by College policy, is based on questionnaires (Appendix II) distributed after Information Literacy classes. The numbers gathered are often given twice: first, as actual numbers of responses and second, as percentages. These figures are normally compared to data from previous performance evaluations. Teaching faculty members also provide collective Divisional or Departmental data to which their own can be compared.

6. Peer Classroom Observation: The results of this observation may be given in the form of a checklist (Appendix III) or may be a written narrative. The observer may be another librarian or the instructor who has requested the Literacy Information class. The librarian consults with the observer beforehand to decide which form the report will take and what, if anything, the librarian would like the observer to focus on. At least one peer observation is required by College policy during each performance evaluation period.

7. Chairperson Input: This form (Appendix IV) allows the Library Chairperson to comment on all eight competencies. This input is based in part on at least one classroom observation. Chairperson input is required by College policy.

8. Department Head Evaluation Questionnaire: Not all faculty are responsible for staff. Those who are will often use a rating scale (Appendix V) to allow staff to comment on communication effectiveness, goal completion, delegation of responsibility, personal

skills, and leadership. The form also allows for written comments: What do you think makes this person an effective administrator? How do you feel this person could increase his/her effectiveness? The librarian being evaluated may substitute a modified SGIF (Small Group Instructional Feedback) in order to gather appropriate information from staff members. This group encounter is facilitated by someone from outside the Library, often the faculty member responsible for Faculty Development. The librarian is neither present at this session nor told which individuals made which comments. It is the responsibility of the facilitator to elicit individual comments and distill those comments into a group consensus. The results of the SGIF are generally presented to the faculty member orally, first. Then, after discussion, the facilitator writes up the results in a summary for the performance evaluation package.

9. Peer Input: This form, which is actually the same one used by the Library Chairperson (Appendix IV), allows for input from peers, be they other librarians or teaching faculty. Faculty from outside the Library who are being asked for comments will often provide those comments in a written narrative rather than using this form. Peer input is required by College policy.

10. Reference Activity Scoring Sheet: Any librarian who has Reference Desk duty may request an evaluation of his or her performance at the Reference Desk. (Appendix VI) These evaluations/observations are normally undertaken by the Reference Librarian. The Reference Librarian is evaluated/observed by the Library Chairperson.

11. Key Result Areas: This form (Appendix VII) outlines departmental goals and objectives for each year. In the performance evaluation package, the librarian briefly comments on the outcomes for these goals and objectives.

12. Professional Development Profile: The Professional Development Profile which outlines professional development goals, objectives, and activities for the coming years is required of each faculty member prior to requesting professional development funds. If there are any significant areas of weakness in the faculty member's performance, it is useful to incorporate ways of addressing these weaknesses into the Professional Development Profile. However, inclusion of the Professional Development Profile is optional.

EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAMME:

Over time, the performance evaluation programme at Red Deer College has changed and will, of course, continue to change. In fact, a major change alluded to above, has taken place quite recently. The formal performance evaluation programme now only applies to those faculty members who are sessional or probationary faculty. All faculty who are continuous members of the College have been judged to be competent in all core competencies. Thus, no further formal performance evaluation packages will be required unless the Dean becomes concerned that the faculty member's performance may no longer be meeting the standard in one or more of the core competencies. If this happens, an extraordinary performance evaluation may be called. An extraordinary performance evaluation and the package which results from it will follow all the guidelines above.

All faculty members on continuous appointment will continue to collect data and many faculty members, including all librarians, continue to produce performance evaluation packages. Many agree with Rebecca Kroll:

> There is some question as to whether senior librarians need to be reviewed at all. It could be argued, however, that it is only a matter of common courtesy for each librarian to have a regular opportunity to engage in formal, two-way communication with the library management, however good the informal communications may appear. (Kroll 32)

The recent changes have been made to encourage faculty members to take more responsibility for performance evaluation. They are meant to promote a formative rather than a summative system of evaluation. There is an expectation that as professionals, all faculty members at Red Deer College will use the results of the ongoing data-gathering process to enhance their professional competence.

However, these changes are very new and have yet to be fully tested. Only time will tell if the move from regular, triannual performance evaluations was wise, And only time will tell if the extraordinary performance evaluation process meets the needs of both faculty and administration.

REFERENCES:

Durey, Peter, "The appraisal and professional development of staff in academic libraries", *New Zealand Libraries*. 46(9):7-9, March 1991.

Holleman, Peggy, "Evaluating community college faculty librarians", *Community and Junior College Libraries*. 2(1):63-72, Fall 1983.

Kaehr, Robert E., "Personnel appraisal, who needs it?", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. 16(1):35-36, March 1990.

Kroll, H. Rebecca, "Beyond evaluation: performance appraisal as a planning and motivational tool in libraries", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. 9(1):27-32, March 1983.

September, P.E., "The use of staff performance appraisal in academic libraries", *South African Journal of Library and Information Science*. 56(2):106-119, 1988.

Smith, Karen F. & Gemma DeVinney, "Peer review for academic librarians", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. 10(2):87-91, May 1984.

Wallace, Patricia M., "Performance evaluation: the use of a single instrument for university librarians and teaching faculty", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. 12(5):284-290, November 1986.

DEAN'S SUMMARY REPORT (LIBRARIAN)

Evaluation for the period _____ 19___ to _____ 19___

Faculty Member's Name: _____

Division: _____ Department/Program: _____

Other Major Responsibilities and Accomplishments: _____

_____

EVALUATION SUMMARY: The following ratings represent the Dean's assessment of performance in each of the core competencies based on information from students, peers and supervisor as summarized by the Faculty Member in the Self Evaluation Report.

		Competent	Unsatisfactory
I.	Planning for Effective Service	( )	( )
II.	Communication Effectiveness	( )	( )
III.	Learning Environment & Support	( )	( )
IV.	Management Effectiveness	( )	( )
V.	Knowledge of Discipline	( )	( )
VI.	Practice of Discipline	( )	( )
VII.	Professional Responsibilities	( )	( )
VIII.	Contribution to College & Community	( )	( )
	Overall Rating:	( )	( )

_____ _____

Dean's Signature Date

I have read this summary and the enclosed comments and discussed them with my Dean.

Please check one:

( ) I agree.
( ) I agree, however, (see attached).
( ) I disagree (see attached).

_____ _____

Faculty Member's Signature Date

May/89.

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

LRC ORIENTATION (Library Instruction)

Please complete both sides of this paper

COURSE: _____ SECTION: _____

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME: _____

1. Did you attend the LRC Orientation session for your class? Yes ___ No ___

2. (Answer only if you answered "No" to No. 1) Why not?

_____

_____

(Please skip to Question 7).

3. Were the following parts of the presentation useful to you?

	Useful	Confusing	Didn't Have
The Library of Congress Classification System	___	___	___
How to use the computer catalogue	___	___	___
How to find a book listed on the computer catalogue	___	___	___
How to find your way around the library	___	___	___
Printed handouts	___	___	___
The library exercise	___	___	___

4. Do you now feel reasonably comfortable when

using the computer catalogue?	Yes ___	No ___	Have not used	___
finding a book on the shelf?	Yes ___	No ___	Have not used	___
using periodical indexes?	Yes ___	No ___	Have not used	___
using audiovisual materials?	Yes ___	No ___	Have not used	___
doing research in the LRC for an assignment?	Yes ___	No ___	Have not used	___

5. Have you used the library for a regular course assignment since the orientation?

Yes ___ No ___

(If No, skip to Question 7)

6. Describe any problems you had in completing this assignment.

_____

_____

_____

7. Would you recommend to your instructor that an LRC orientation be held for this course again next year?

Yes ___ No ___

8. Do you have any suggestions that would improve our orientation program, or that would make it easier for you to use our library?

_____

_____

_____

Please turn over.

Answer the following only if you attended the session for your class (i.e. if you answered "Yes" to Question 1).

Check one response for each question:

NA Not Applicable, Don't Know
SA Strongly Agree
A Agree
D Disagree
SD Strongly Disagree

9. The librarian was well prepared for the class. NA ___ SA ___ A ___ D ___ SD ___

10. The material was presented in a clear, well organized manner. NA ___ SA ___ A ___ D ___ SD ___

11. The audiovisual materials helped clarify the material. NA ___ SA ___ A ___ D ___ SD ___

12. The audiovisual materials were clear and easy to read. NA ___ SA ___ A ___ D ___ SD ___

13. Comments or questions were encouraged. NA ___ SA ___ A ___ D ___ SD ___

Check one response for each question:

14. The orientation for this course was held
___ too early in the semester.
___ at the right time.
___ too late in the semester.

15. The time allocated for the orientation was
___ too short.
___ just right.
___ too long.

16. For my knowledge of libraries the level of difficulty of this presentation was
___ very elementary.
___ somewhat elementary.
___ about right.
___ somewhat difficult.
___ very difficult.

17. For me, the pace at which the librarian covered the material was
___ very slow.
___ somewhat slow.
___ just about right.
___ somewhat fast.
___ very fast.

18. Overall, I would rate the quality of the presentation
___ excellent
___ good
___ satisfactory
___ fair
___ poor.

19. Overall, I would rate the value of this presentation in helping me complete my assignments this year
___ not applicable
___ excellent
___ good
___ satisfactory
___ fair
___ poor.

20. Comments:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX III

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FORM

			Rating Scale Low				High
A)	**Planning for effective instruction:**						
1.	Instructor's goals for the bibliographic instruction were clearly identified.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Goals for students were identified and behaviorally expressed.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Teaching strategies for goals were identified.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Methods of assessing learning were identified.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
5.	The classroom was set up appropriately for the lesson.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
B)	**Presentation:**						
1.	The students understood the reason for the presentation.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
2.	The objectives for the lesson were understood.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Ideas, topics and activities were presented in an organized manner.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
4.	A variety of communication styles, verbal and non-verbal, were used.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Audiovisual materials were: a) Technically of good quality.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
	b) Used effectively.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
6.	The blackboard was used effectively, i.e. writing clear and large enough to be seen. Organized material.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Student involvement was encouraged.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Student questions/comments were responded to in a positive non-patronizing, accurate, unbiased manner.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Content matched the objectives.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Content was relevant to: a) student level of preparation	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
	b) student needs for course.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5

		Rating Scale Low				High
11.	Student understanding of the material was assessed throughout the presentation.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Instruction was adapted to accommodate the level of student understanding.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Attention of the students was maintained.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Class time was used effectively. Presentation was appropriate for time available.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Enthusiasm for the subject matter and for the learning process was displayed by the instructor.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Links from content to specific student needs were made during the presentation.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Willingness to assist students within and outside the class was portrayed. Rapport was established.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Students were encouraged to take responsibility for their own learning.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Opportunities for guided practice to apply content presented were provided.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
20.	An evaluation of student learning took place.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
21.	The presentation had a definite begin and end.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Any instructions given were clear and understood by the class.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Overall rating of class.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Other observations and additional comments:						

Instructor Evaluation

C) General:

		Rating Scale Low				High
25. The students learning what I expected they would from this session.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
26. I found this presentation to be interesting and informative.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
27. I would have this presentation in my class again.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5

Suggested Changes:

Updated: April 8, 1991.
<ClasRoom.Evl>

DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES

LEARNING RESOURCES CENTRE

ASSESSMENT OF FACULTY

DEPARTMENT HEADS INPUT TO FACULTY EVALUATION

Faculty Member Evaluated: _____

Evaluator: _____ **Discipline:** _____

The evaluation below is based upon the following:

I. PLANNING FOR EFFECTIVE SERVICE

Criteria:

1. Establishes goals and objectives which are consistent with those of the department, the division, and the College's mandate and core mission.
2. Manages LRC space effectively.
3. Adapts services to meet identified needs as reflected in changes in the College mandate and in the curriculum needs of users.
4. Incorporates current developments where appropriate.
5. Develops and implements appropriate procedures and policies for his/her area.

Primary source of information:

a) Overall impressions: _____ b) Direct observations: _____

Comments:

II. COMMUNICATION EFFECTIVENESS

Criteria:

1. Effectively communicates information, direction or assistance to individual users.
2. Communicates effectively, both verbally and through the use of instructional aids such as blackboards, audio-visual tools, demonstrations, etc. during classroom presentations.
3. Treats all subject matter objectively.
4. Accomplishes stated objectives for learning.

Primary source of information:

a) Overall impressions: _____ b) Direct observations: _____

Comments:

III. LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS AND SUPPORT

Criteria:

1. Creates an environment in which users are free to express themselves and ask questions.
2. Creates and maintains user interest.
3. Encourages users to think critically/creatively.
4. Encourages users to assume responsibility for their learning.

Primary source of information:

a) Overall impressions: _____ b) Direct observations: _____

Comments:

IV. **MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS**

Criteria:

1. Selects, develops and evaluates staff in area of responsibility.
2. Maintains effective working relationships with staff.
3. Assists in the preparation of budget requirements.
4. Prepares annual and other reports.
5. Achieves goals and objectives set for his/her area.

Primary source of information:

a) Overall impressions: _____ b) Direct observations: _____

Comments:

V. **KNOWLEDGE OF DISCIPLINE**

Criteria:

1. Is well read, knowledgeable, and current in terms of breadth/depth in his/her discipline.
2. Has a thorough knowledge of resources and collections.

Primary source of information:

a) Overall impressions: _____ b) Direct observations: _____

Comments:

VI. PRACTICE OF DISCIPLINE

Criteria:

1. Selects learning materials (print and non-print), using recognized professional theories, methods and techniques, which complement and supplement curriculum objectives.

2. Is effective in the application of his/her discipline to his/her specific position.

Primary source of information:

a) Overall impressions: _____ b) Direct observations: _____

Comments:

VII. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Criteria:

1. Engages in appropriate development activities.

2. Strives to increase his/her effectiveness as a librarian.

3. Maintains a high level of professional ethics.

4. Participates effectively in departmental/divisional activities.

5. Operates in concert with College policies and procedures.

6. Accepts responsibility for establishing and maintaining effective working relationships.

Primary source of information:

a) Overall impressions: _____ b) Direct observations: _____

Comments:

VIII. CONTRIBUTION TO COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY

Criteria:

1. Maintains appropriate participation with College and/or discipline related community activities.

Primary source of information:

a) Overall impressions: _____ b) Direct observations: _____

Comments:

Faculty member: _____ **Evaluator:** _____

Date: _____

March 6, 1991.
<Forms\FacEval.DH>

DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES

LEARNING RESOURCES CENTRE

STAFF INPUT

TO EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT HEAD/SUPERVISOR

Individual Evaluated: _____

Please return to: _____ **by** _____

Section A

For each question in Section A circle the number that most closely describes this supervisor, from **Almost Never (1)** to **Almost Always (5)**.

The supervisor:

1. Is fair and consistent in dealing with staff (does not show favoritism to any one staff member)

   Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 **Almost Always**

2. Is willing to try new ideas.

   Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 **Almost Always**

3. Shows concern and interest in my professional/career development.

   Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 **Almost Always**

4. Listens to and considers suggestions, complaints, questions and requests of staff.

   Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 **Almost Always**

5. When appropriate, is willing to take action and suggest staff recommendations to management.

   Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 **Almost Always**

6. Is willing to explain reasons for administrative actions and decisions.

   Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 **Almost Always**

7. Maintains open communication within the department and with other areas.

   Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 **Almost Always**

8. Does not take undue advantage of the position.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

9. Displays skills in tact, diplomacy, and competence in maintaining a positive relationship with the users and the public.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

10. Clearly establishes job responsibilities and provides well-planned training and orientation.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

11. Anticipates future developments and problems.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

12. Gives clear explanations.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

13. Consults when appropriate.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

14. Makes sound logical decisions.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

15. Plans ahead when possible.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

16. Organizes and runs effective meetings.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

17. Takes requests and complaints seriously and responds promptly.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

18. Gives praise when deserved.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

19. Uses a problem-solving approach to deal with problems as they arise.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

20. Is willing to act as an advocate for staff concerns to higher management.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

21. Is helpful and constructive in evaluations of staff members.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

22. Produces work of high quality.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

23. Shows good communication skills.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

24. Displays good leadership skills.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

25. Avoids responding with hostility or defensiveness when receiving a complaint.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

26. Asks employees if there is anything that can be done to make their work more fulfilling, effective, and challenging.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

27. The overall skills and attributes of the Supervisor serve to build and maintain a high level of staff morale.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

28. Keeps staff informed of relevant college and divisional policies, procedures, and activities.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

29. Involves individuals or groups in decision-making related to their work.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

30. Involves staff in planning for the future.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

31. Helps staff members solve working problems.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

32. Encourages suggestions for improved methods, etc.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

33. Is organized and on top of things pertaining to the area being supervised.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

34. Is knowledgeable about the policies, procedures and operations of the area being supervised.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

35. Is knowledgeable about the theory pertaining to the area and is able to apply it.

Almost Never 1 2 3 4 5 Almost Always

Section B

What specific problem areas, or weaknesses, have you observed?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Strengths you would like to see maintained. _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Other comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Revised: March 6, 1991.
<Forms\Eval-Sup.Stf>

APPENDIX VI

LEARNING RESOURCES CENTRE

REFERENCE ACTIVITY SCORING SHEET

Question: _____

_____

Reference Interview	Satis-factory	Unsatis-factory	N/A	Problems
1. Educational level of enquiry assessed.				
2. Question clarified; real need determined.				
3. Amount of information needed assessed.				
4. Time constraints of user assessed.				
5. Library skills already held determined.				
6. User's ability level assessed.				

Action Taken:	Satis-factory	Unsatis-factory	N/A	Problems
Simple Questions:				
1. Used appropriate source.				
2. Factual questions: Gave accurate information.				
3. Factual questions: documented source(s).				
4. Gave instruction in skills as needed.				
5. Treated person objectively.				
6. Treated subject matter objectively.				
7. Handled telephone inquiries appropriately.				

Action Taken: cont'd	Satis-factory	Unsatis-factory	N/A	Problems
Complex Questions: Research Instruction:				
1. Gave alternate approaches.				
2. Outlined a search strategy.				
3. Referred to appropriate resources.				
4. Checked on progress.				
5. Provided info rather than instruction when appropriate.				
6. Consulted with others when appropriate.				
7. Balanced needs and time: "Triage".				
8. Demonstrated ability to terminate enquiry.				

Manners:	Satis-factory	Unsatis-factory	N/A	Problems
1. Friendly and approachable.				
2. Alert to shy or non-assertive users.				
3. Responded positively to all enquiries.				
4. Provided alternatives when LRC could not satisfy request.				
5. Left user with feeling of positive assistance.				

Rev. March 5, 1991.
<Forms\Eval-Ref.Act>

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES DIVISION

KEY RESULT AREAS

FOR

Period:

Key Result Area (to be filled out at beginning of period)	**Completion Date**	**Actual Date Completed**	**Actual Results** (to be filled out at end of period)

Staff Signature _____ Date _____ Supervisor Signature _____ Date _____

Approved:

Signature _____ Date _____

APPENDIX VII

<Fac-Eval>
Sept./89.